DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 412 628 EA 028 702

AUTHOR	Wynn, Joan R.
TITLE	Bike Shops, Tumbling Teams, and Other Primary Supports: Opportunities for Learning and Civic Life. Final Deliverable to OERI. Draft.
INSTITUTION	Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools, Madison, WI.; Wisconsin Center for Education Research, Madison.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1996-05-00
NOTE	43p.
CONTRACT	R117Q00005-95
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Elementary Secondary Education; *Human Capital; *Partnerships in Education; *School Community Relationship; *Social Networks; *Student Development; Student Experience; Volunteers

ABSTRACT

Voluntary associations can powerfully contribute to the learning and development of young people and operate in ways that both rely on and extend social capital. In this paper these associations are called "primary supports" because they focus on promoting the learning and development of all young people and because of the presence and ongoing investment of adults. This paper focuses on art, drama, and music groups; sports teams; afterschool programs; religious youth groups; youth entrepreneurship and community-service opportunities; and the resources of parks, libraries, community centers, and settlement houses. The paper begins by highlighting the contribution of primary supports to learning and development, and the ways in which primary supports both depend on and generate social capital in the course of promoting development. The paper next considers two different kinds of connections between primary supports and schools. The first is what primary-support practices may offer to schools as institutions, with their potential to serve as models for instructional practice. The second concerns the complementarity between primary supports and schools and the ways in which creating connections among them may enhance what each is able to achieve for the learning and development of young people and for the creation of social capital. Building connections among individuals and institutions important in the lives of young people is one way to work toward creating mutually reinforcing opportunities for youth. In sum, connections among individuals in networks of voluntary association are the basis of civic engagement and action. (Contains 50 references.) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 412 628

Bike Shops, Tumbling Teams, and Other Primary Supports: Opportunities for Learning and Civic Life

Joan R. Wynn

Draft--Please do not cite or circulate without permission;
comments appreciated

May 1996

Chapin Hall Center for Children
University of Chicago
1313 East 60th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60637
312-753-5900

FINAL DELIVERABLE TO OERI

Prepublication Draft. Chapter to be included in Wehlage, G. G., & White, J. A. (Eds.). (in progress). *Rebuilding the Village: Social Capital and Education in America*. London: Falmer Press. Not for quotation or reproduction without permission.

This paper was prepared at the Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools, supported by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement (Grant No. R117Q0005-95) and by the Wisconsin Center for Education Research, School of Education, University of Wisconsin-Madison. The opinions expressed in this publication are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the supporting agencies.

EA 028 702

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

I. Introduction

Voluntary associations can powerfully contribute to the learning and development of young people and operate in ways that both rely on and extend social capital. The associations that are the focus of this chapter are part of the familiar social world of children and families. They include art, drama, and music groups; sports teams; afterschool programs; religious youth groups; youth entrepreneurship and community service opportunities; and the resources of parks, libraries, community centers, and settlement houses. In this chapter these associations are called "primary supports" because they focus on promoting the learning and development of all young people, rather than on the treatment of a sub-set of youth with specialized needs, and because of the presence and ongoing investment of adults they offer.[1]

Primary supports are associations that can function as engaging and rigorous settings for cognitive and social development, as "places that raise kids up in education and in life." They provide opportunities to participate in activities and issues of importance, involving participants in environments of high expectations and sustained support. These opportunities, in which youth initiative is central, contribute to developing competencies critical for individual achievement in both education and employment and for participation in civic life (Wynn et al., 1994; Pittman & Wright, 1991; Wynn, in press).

Through their roots in communities and informal ways of relating to participants, these associations can generate networks of engagement and trust on which the formation of social capital and investment in the common good depend (Pittman & Wright, 1991; Heath & McLaughlin, 1993; Whalen & Wynn, 1995). In the service of building individual competencies, many primary supports intentionally broaden youth contacts with people and

1

places in and beyond the communities in which they live, and seek alliances with parents, schools, and services important to the development of children. In the course of these interactions, primary supports serve a bridging function that can assist in mobilizing resources for youth and creating connections among youth and adults across the settings in their lives, thereby extending connections and increasing opportunities for the generation of social capital.

This chapter begins by highlighting the contribution of primary supports to learning and development, and the ways in which primary supports both depend on and generate social capital in the course of promoting development. Because of the centrality of schools to the learning enterprise and the lives of young people, this chapter goes on to consider two quite different kinds of connections between primary supports and schools. The first is what primary support *practices* may offer to schools as institutions, with their potential to serve as models or influences for instructional practice. The second concerns the *complementarity* between primary supports and schools and ways in which creating connections among them may enhance what each is able to achieve for the learning and development of young people and for the creation of social capital. The chapter concludes by raising research and policy issues concerning primary supports and schools and the implications of creating or increasing connections among them.

II. Primary Supports: Some Examples

This chapter focuses on primary supports that attract and engage adolescents and are described by participants, program observers, and researchers as among the best of their kind. This age group and set of primary supports are selected for two reasons. First, both research

and policy have focused more attention on primary supports for young children, including day care, family support programs, and information and referral resources--and on their potential contribution to child development, family functioning, and student readiness to learn (Weiss, 1988; Weissbourd & Kagan, 1989; Kagan et al., 1995). Second, adolescents, more than younger children, are likely to resist or drift away from organizational affiliation, including school affiliation; this makes understanding the attributes of primary support organizations that elicit the participation and focused performance of adolescents relevant not only for policy and practice in primary supports as a sector but potentially for policy and practice in other settings including schools.

The opportunities for affiliation and learning made available through primary supports are important for all young people and the communities in which they live. They can play an even more central role for youth in disadvantaged or depleted inner-city communities, where exposure to opportunities beyond home and school are often limited and connections among institutions often sparse, if not antagonistic (Heath & McLaughlin, 1993; Furstenberg, 1990; Ianni, 1989). Because of this and the emphasis in this volume on the role of social capital in shaping more effective education, particularly for poor and minority youth, the programs used here to illustrate the practices and potential of primary supports are drawn from programs serving inner-city youth.

These programs have been selected from the research, policy, and practice literature focusing on organizations that attract and retain the participation of youth and are considered well conceived and implemented (Heath and McLaughlin, 1994; Pittman and Wynn, in press; Pittman and Cahill, 1992; Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 1992; Canada, 1995.

The attributes of primary supports that engage adolescents described in the next section are also drawn from these sources.) The programs described here suggest the range and variety of primary support programs for urban youth, in orientation and content and in location around the country.

> El Puente, founded in 1982, seeks to create connections for youth in Brooklyn's Williamsburg neighborhood and to link their development to the development of the community. Housed in what was once an imposing church, El Puente offers exercise, athletic training, and free health services; performing, visual, and media arts projects; education; and community service internships for 12- to 21-year-olds. A core of its activities for both youth and adults focus on "giving back," often through attention to issues of environmental action (e.g., combating neighborhood toxins) and social justice (e.g., police treatment of minorities).
>
> The *Jesse White Tumbling Team* draws its members, aged 6 to 26, largely from Cabrini Green, a high-rise public housing development in Chicago. The tumblers perform rigorous routines at parades and festivals in Chicago, at half-time at the Bulls and Bears games, and on trips to places as distant as Japan. The team headquarters is a small storefront office open from 8 a.m. until 7 p.m. It is not only a place for members to meet up for travel to the team's performances and to practice weight training, but also a place where they come to find team adults and each other and to be off the streets.
>
> The *Bicycle Action Project* (BAP) is a full-service bike shop run for and by youth. Begun in 1988, the program primarily serves young people aged 9 to 16, and often older youth, from a low-income community in Indianapolis. In the core activity, young people invest 25 hours in learning bike mechanics and earn a bicycle they restore in the process. After earning a bike, participants can be involved in increasingly demanding learning and performance through road touring or an off-road racing team, working in the retail shop, or joining the management team as advanced mechanics or instructors.
>
> Since 1977, Youth Communication has published *New Expression*, a teen-produced newspaper with a monthly circulation of 80,000. Written "by, for, and about teens," the Chicago paper has spawned replications in 12 cities. Annually, more than 100 Chicago youth gain experience in journalism, photography, illustration, desktop publishing, sales and management through production of *New Expression*.
>
> Lemmon Avenue Bridge is a youth center for 12- to 19-year-olds in Oaklawn and East Dallas that is shaped by youth-expressed interests and needs and governed by youth-set rules. The Bridge provides core staff, operates a drop-in center and a library and

place for homework, and offers space to 24 organizations offering activities including athletics, tutoring, outdoor adventure, health and dental exams, photography, counseling, arts and cultural activities. Its goals are to give adolescents a place to be, access to adults, and experiences in which to gain competencies and ground development.

Belying its bureaucratic name, the *Office of Special Programs* (OSP) at the University of Chicago is an enrichment program for low-income youth from age 10 through the college years. Begun in 1968, OSP aims to capture youth interests in learning and to broaden connections to a larger civic and cultural community in Chicago and beyond. Using sports as an important activity and draw for many, OSP provides tutorial assistance, academic and life planning, and enrichment--including a touring, youth-operated planetarium. Activities and teaching draw in part on university faculty, and on older participants and program graduates.

Begun in 1969, the Explainer Program at the San Francisco Exploratorium engages youth 15 to 20 as floor guides to the museum's science, art, and human perception exhibits. The program provides an interactive learning environment for youth through activities such as exhibit building, maintenance, visitor interaction, and teaching. A background in science is not required, and half the roughly 100 youth involved a year are from low- and lower-middle- income households.

Rheedlen Centers for Children and Families serves one of the poorest areas in Central Harlem. While it has expanded its mission to include a focus on families and neighborhoods, since 1970 Rheedlen has offered after-school, evening, and weekend activities for youth. These activities include dance, fine arts, and theater; tutoring and academic enrichment; a Tae Kwon Do Club and other athletic activities; instruction in practical skills like babysitting, budgeting and banking; and opportunities for youth-led social action.

Since 1987, the CornerStone Project in Little Rock, Arkansas, has operated a drop-in neighborhood facility offering after-school tutoring; dance, arts, and theater; field trips; physical fitness; and peer counseling. After volunteering, tutoring, and attending classes for 50 hours, youth can participate in skills-building activities leading to center jobs and jobs in a youth-operated recycling business.

III. The Attributes Through Which Primary Supports Generate Both Competencies and Social Capital

Social capital describes features of social structure that enable or constrain actions among individuals. These actions may be the vigilance of adults that, on the one hand, can enable children to play in a public park or, on the other, can ensure that parents hear from

others if their children are out of line. Social capital "inheres in the structure of relations" between and among people, in networks of engagement, norms of reciprocity, and trust (Coleman, 1990). The more dense and extensive the networks, the more likely it is that the individuals involved will know and trust each other well enough to cooperate for mutual benefit; and if their lives overlap in a number of settings, that they will both be able and more likely to reinforce norms and impose sanctions that promote actions contributing to the common good (Putnam, 1993; Coleman, 1990).

The investment of social capital in the next generation is fundamental to enhancing the development of youth (Coleman, 1988; Coleman & Hoffer 1987). Relationships with adults are central to transmitting norms and transferring knowledge and skills to young people, and to providing opportunities for demonstrating and consolidating learning once acquired. As Coleman points out, an environment that enhances the development of children requires intergenerational and network closure, that the parents and other adults with whom children spend their lives know each other and know the other children with whom youth associate (Coleman, 1988). The more parents, teachers, coaches, youth ministers, and other adults in children's lives interact in multiple settings--meeting each other picking up student report cards, shopping in the neighborhood, and attending religious services, youth basketball games, and the like--the more likely they are to talk about the standards and circumstances needed to raise all youth, and the actions of individual young people that do or do not meet these norms.

The connections among adults likely to lead to collective investment in youth are these "horizontal networks," chosen voluntarily, in which there is closure among adults and youth

(Putnam, 1993). At the same time, there are also benefits to be gained from even casual contacts across networks. Such contacts can give both youth and adults access to information and connections of the kind that can advance their lives. Increasing contacts across networks, increases the likelihood that individuals will learn about scholarship opportunities, job openings, and the like (Granovetter, 1973).

Primary supports that engage youth share a number of defining characteristics that reflect their intent--enhancing the development of participants. Primary support programs involve young people in youth-centered undertakings that are guided by adult investment and involve the development of youth-adult relationships. They extend networks and facilitate intergenerational and network closure by involving parents and other adults in young people's lives and in opportunities for the adults to get to know one another. They provide access to information and opportunity by broadening young people's contacts and guiding them into the wider world. They create norms about contribution and reciprocity among participants. They apply sanctions, often created with and by youth, to deal with infractions of membership requirements and failure to contribute. These same characteristics serve to generate and sustain social capital (Coleman, 1990; Putnam, 1993; Ostrom, 1990).

In the course of creating human capital, then, primary supports create and sustain social capital, with the content of programs (writing, athletics, music) focused on human capital and the process (adult-youth relationships, group contribution, development of shared norms and sanctions) focused on social capital, and with human capital development (e.g., increased youth competency) being a product of social capital investment (e.g., the adult-youth relationship). Moreover, the social capital generated in primary support programs is not

confined to the programs, as they involve staff, parents, other adults, and participants in larger patterns of interaction within communities and beyond.

The following sections lay out the ways in which these attributes are reflected in primary supports, and how they combine to enhance the cognitive and social development of participants and to introduce both youth and adults to models for generating and sustaining social capital.

Providing Youth-Centered Undertakings Guided by Ongoing Adult Investments

Primary supports that promote learning and development place youth initiative, interests, and contribution at the center of what they offer and how they operate.[2]

Group Endeavors in which Youth Initiative is Central. Perhaps the paramount characteristic of primary supports that engage adolescents is the centrality of youth initiative. These "youth-centered, not youth-serving" resources see the energy and persistence of youth as an essential ingredient of the way in which they work and a prerequisite of the benefits they offer (Heath & McLaughlin, 1993). Youth initiative informs the shape of primary support programs and the experiences of young people in them, from the initial choice to participate through the investment required for achievement of group goals (Whalen & Wynn, 1995).

Activities and Issues of Importance. Primary supports offer participants opportunities to engage in and shape activities and to address issues of interest to them. In many of these efforts, young people's choices and input relate program activities to significant issues in their lives.

> In *New Expressions*, youth choose to write feature stories like "Terminator Run,"a police practice of picking-up youth they suspect of gang involvement and dropping

> them off in rival territory; columns like"Mama Says,"advice to teen parents from teen parents; and editorials on such subjects as rap music and the right of free speech.[3]
>
> The Teen Youth Council at Rheedlen has led food drives for the homeless, voter registration drives, and anti-violence demonstrations. In its Peacemaker program, youth trained in conflict mediation and organizing are designing safety plans and developing safe passage routes, based on their knowledge of where and why violence is likely to occur (Canada, 1995).

Through activities like these youth in primary support programs have opportunities to learn about and affect their environments, and to do so in ways recognized and respected by adults. Chances to have an impact on the world around them through their own initiative, important for all adolescents, may be particularly important for youth of minority, inner-city communities, who are often isolated from mainstream opportunities and prospects for productive futures.

Group Problem-Solving. In pursuing the goals they have set, young people in primary support programs are often engaged in efforts in which there are multiple pathways toward their aims, and no single "right answer." The need for group problem-solving is an attribute of many primary support activities, including writing and presenting a theater performance, producing a newspaper, and pursuing a social action agenda. Each of these activities necessitates selecting a topic or target of action, choosing among options for proceeding, and following through on multiple, distinct steps that need to come together in implementation.

In the course of building skills and achieving goals, groups depend on the diverse interests, talents, skills, and experiences of their members, both their basic interests and skills (in writing or photography, for example) and their incidental knowledge and experience (use of the Web, Lexus/Nexus, or library resources to inform articles or action agendas).

Dependence on individual contributions is coupled with the participants' need to exercise responsibility, negotiate, and compromise as part of problem-solving to reach desired results.

Concrete Products and Performances. Through primary supports, young people's initiative is mobilized and their energy invested in developing quality products and "showcase" performances whose merit is judged by an external audience (Heath & McLaughlin, 1993). Sources of independent assessment are varied, including younger participants' responses to youth leadership, the outcomes of team competitions, responses of audiences at performances, and feedback from customers at youth-run enterprises. This feedback contributes to a sense of real-world involvement and achievement and can legitimate what youth may see as the invested judgement of program staff.

Many programs also involve participants in self-assessment during preparation and in critique and reflection on their own performances. Members of the youth newspaper for example, have post-mortem sessions on their most recent edition prior to gearing up for the coming month. In primary supports, staff interactions with youth are often sprinkled with questions like "What's the problem here?" "What would make this better?" "What do you think?" Although external judgment can validate youth performance, self-assessment and reflection contribute to participants' sense that the process and product still belong to them. As "responsible agents and monitors of their performances," they have not relinquished control; and the next performance or product can be improved (Ball & Heath, 1993).

The Ongoing Investment of Adults. Adults' positive views of the capacity and potential of youth are reflected not only in what they expect from participants (initiative, persistence, solid performance), as discussed above, but also in what they, the adults, offer. Staff act both

as "gentle, but firm critic[s]" and as sources of sustained, predictable support (McLaughlin, 1993). Primary supports are one of the few settings in which youth come to know adults on whom they can depend and who can serve as role models in a substantive sense, settings in which young people have enough ongoing opportunities to see adult values and behavior in action that they can use these as a guide for their own development and conduct.

Primary supports frequently offer opportunities for intensive involvement, staying open long hours and providing connections between youth and programs over long periods of time.

> According to Larry Hawkins, OSP's director, the program uses its space as a community center. "We're in it all times of the day and night, Saturdays and Sundays, that kind of thing. . .we spend so much time and we fool around with the kids so much. That's how you get them, it's a time factor. . .you can't farm it out, you can't send memos about it. You just have to put the time in. . . A lot of hamburgers. A lot of sitting around and talking and getting the kids to feel 'this guy's interested in me, not in something else.'. . .with children, you can't say 'well from 9 to 5 I'll talk about this or I'll teach this and this and he'll learn it.' No. Some people want to talk or to learn from ten to eleven at night. That's when they're open."

Staff in some programs carry beepers and in others give youth their home numbers. The Tumblers, for example, have access to Jesse White 24 hours a day. Leaders of these programs have often been associated with schools, as teachers or coaches for example, but were frustrated with the bureaucratic boundaries and limited engagement with youth in these settings (McLaughlin, et al., 1994; Health & McLaughlin, 1994). The common thread is that adult program staff are accessible and responsive.

As part of their commitment to youth, adults set high expectations and offer sustained supports. These expectations reflect standards about personal and social development as well as standards related to achievement in education and employment.

> Jesse White insists on school attendance, passing grades, and solid behavior in all aspects of the Tumbler's lives--no drinking, no swearing, no smoking, no drugs.

> Tumblers must show up on time, with themselves and their uniforms in fit condition. Team members are expected to contribute their utmost to performances and to engage in respectful, good- mannered interactions with the public for whom they perform.
>
> The Bicycle Action Project expects young people to be responsible for themselves and for a bicycle. Youth interested in participating fill out an application and have to persist in returning to set a first appointment, and subsequent weekly appointments for the 12 weeks it takes most youth to earn a bike. Young people interested in owing a more complex bicycle, a racing bike for example, are required to take home their basic bike and bring it back in sound repair as a trade-in after investing another 25 hours in learning more advanced bike mechanics. In these earn-a-bike programs and in interactions with shop customers, youth are expected to arrive on time, to work intensively as part of a small group of youth and adults, to be attentive and respectful to each other, instructors, customers, and equipment alike.

The sense of support available in primary support programs comes in part from adults who invest themselves and go "an extra mile" for youth, adults who "dedicate valuable resources without resentment: protection, interest, time, affection" (Connell, 1992).

> According to Charles Hammond, director of the Bicycle Action Project, "The whole nurturing of a kid's sense of belonging and being special and being worth spending time with...that's my concept of a traditional parent role: nurturing and building a kid, and where that doesn't happen, we find ourselves filling in."

Jesse White sees himself as a surrogate father, both disciplinarian and invested adult, for the young people in his orbit. As Brice Heath and McLaughlin note: "Not surprisingly, these out-of-school settings--whether they be grassroots youth organizations, local chapters of national groups (such as Boys Clubs, Future Farmers of America, and so on), local religious organizations, or parks and recreation centers--share many of the features that in earlier eras characterized family life" (Heath & McLaughlin, 1991, p. 625).

Through these family-like connections, primary supports can supplement social capital for youth living in families in which it may be structurally diminished (single-parent families) or functionally diminished (two-parent working families), and in neighborhoods lacking

associational networks (Coleman, 1988). Primary supports are engaged in transferring knowledge and skills not simply though a process of didactic instruction. Instead, they are attentive to actively engaging young people in the pleasures and rewards of mastery in a chosen undertaking, they offer structure and standards for mastery; and they create environments that both expect young people to be contributors and consistently invest in young people's capacity to contribute.

Extending Networks and Facilitating Intergenerational and Network Closure

Primary supports are places in which youth can get to know a wider circle of adults and young people than in home or school settings. They may be one of the few places in which young people can engage with others across age groups as well as across schools, thus extending networks. For parents and children living in dangerous neighborhoods, primary supports can be a setting in which residents are willing to set aside vigilance in order to come to know others or to allow their children to participate in opportunities that enable them to do so (Furstenberg, 1990; Kotlowitz, 1991; Venkatesh, 1993). Primary supports can engage the energies of youth and adults in collective action that can contribute to changing the balance of what is present in otherwise depleted communities (National Crime Prevention Council, 1992).

Developing and Extending Intergenerational Networks. In primary support settings, youth can meet and come to know adults in ways that range from casual and intermittent to intense and ongoing. Both kinds of interactions contribute to a sense of connection to a larger community:

Young people can have sustained interaction with adults in a number of roles. Often, staff in primary support programs are themselves from the community--people who know the challenges facing youth, who may have stumbled themselves but who have "made it" and returned to invest in the community and its next generation, to return what was invested in them. Programs often call on the energies and examples of graduates, youth who are enrolled in college or employed, to return as models and resources.

> Youth Communication creates a directory of its alumni in part to enable current and former participants to know the whereabouts of graduates and to be able to call on them if they are interested in advanced education or employment opportunities graduates have had.

In addition, many programs rely on volunteers who can connect young people to communities beyond their own. CYCLE, an educational enrichment program in Chicago, operates with 200 volunteer tutors, people from area colleges and businesses. As a participant explained,

> I had a tutor this year who helped me get ready for college, and they were professional, they worked for an advertising company. We talked about a lot of different things, about everything. It was really interesting. I learned a lot of things I didn't know. I mean, because a lot of times I need help with my homework and I just got it from a different type of person who gave me a perspective on things.

Though youth may be drawn to primary supports because of the activities they offer, what tends to keep them over time is the connections they make with adults and with each other in these programs (Pittman & Cahill, 1992; Pittman & Wynn, et. al. in press). These connections, which often entail both giving and receiving, include older participants helping with younger; graduates returning; adults who act as volunteer leaders, tutors, mentors; and the people in communities whom youth serve in youth-contribution, community-service

programs. These are people on whom youth can call now or in the future, and who can call them out, who can provide both social support and social control.

Creating Network Closure. Primary supports often reach out to families, schools, and other institutions important in shaping the lives and development of young people, both connecting with them and helping them to connect to one another. The connections created among parents and between parents and programs are both informal and deliberate. Informally, parents find opportunities to meet each other in circumstances as simple as dropping off or picking up their children, and they have opportunities to interact with program staff at the same times. Programs also create deliberate and more formal opportunities for parents and youth or parents as a group to interact, often in ongoing ways. They create chances for parents and their children to be together ("So they have done something together and have it to talk about, not to be on each other about," as Larry Hawkins sees it.) and to connect families to each other through events like Friday evening family night suppers. Programs also plan parent-only events including aerobics, ESL and GED classes, and outings.

> OSP is constantly trying to reach out and engage parents believing it's the way, long-term, to hook kids into their education. "If the parent doesn't make a big to do over it, then it's easier for the student to drift away." Parents are expected to volunteer at least once a month, and are invited to sit on a Program Advisory Board and Sports Support Team, to come to center activities, to games home and away, and on college tours. Yearly, each child and parent are asked to meet with OSP staff to plan where a student and his or her parent hope she or he will be in twenty years, and to back up from that goal to the now-and-later steps to getting there.
>
> OSP also puts stock in parent-only parent-chosen activities, a blues concert or a shopping expedition, for example. In settings like these, staff have opportunities for informal give and take in which parents are often willing to hear things staff have to say and say things they otherwise would not. As Larry Hawkins sees it, "This kind of

'shopping mall counseling' helps us to build relationships with parents and leadership among them that supports aspirations for children."

This expanded family and parent focus is in part a recognition that parent engagement in student learning is a key asset in "hooking kids into education"; it is also a recognition of parent's own needs and a response to the resentment of some parents toward programs when their children's needs are being addressed and their own are not. Primary supports often point to the importance of two-generation strategies for learning and development as part of investing in the future of inner-city youth (Cahill, 1993; Ramirez & Dewar, 1994; Pittman & Wynn, in press). Through primary supports that reach out to engage them, parents can meet and come to know the parents of their children's peers, as well as adult program staff, which can reinforce norms and sanctions and assist in monitoring youth behavior.

Connections among youth participants and other institutions important in their lives are created in a variety of ways. Programs can be housed in (either sponsored by or using) institutions such as churches, community centers, adult service clubs, ethnic associations, settlement houses, and increasingly schools. This enables youth workers and youth to know the places and people in these organizations. Through the linkages they create among the socializing contexts in the lives of young people, primary supports can facilitate more cohesive messages and reinforce investments in youth across settings (Littell & Wynn, 1989; Venkatesh, 1993).

Providing Access to Broadened Opportunity and Information

Participation in primary supports is in itself about exposure to broadened opportunity and information. For most youth, the choice to engage in primary supports provides access to experiences beyond those offered by two principal environments for young people, family and

school. Beyond this, many programs seek to widen youth exposure further, taking them outside the confines of the program. Primary supports provide a range of opportunities to participants that carry them beyond their known worlds.

> In training young people as Peacemakers, Rheedlen takes staff and youth aged 9 to 15 away for training to the campus of Bowdoin College in Maine. There they learn conflict resolution, research, and organizing skills, and have an opportunity to leave inner-city neighborhoods, to be away ". . . from the front lines of the battlefield" (Canada, 1995)

> Through El Puente's social action agendas, youth, principally of Latino descent, have joined in working with city-wide coalitions composed of members of Hasidic, Polish, Asian, African American, and Latino communities (Ramirez & Dewar, 1994).

Programs consistently work to provide opportunities for achievement in settings that enrich participants' experiences. OSP's director recounts:

> We give our kids sessions on speaking. And then we put our kids to introducing people. One of the groups that deals with the homeless had a banquet and they offered us tickets. I told them that what they could do for us is that I'd like a couple of my kids to introduce some of their speakers. And there were maybe a thousand people there. And I know they were nervous as anything. But they did very well. We're always looking for opportunities like that to get our kids out into the world in ways they wouldn't be.

Through such activities, primary support programs enable young people to gain a social education and in both formal and informal ways to garner information about a wider world and how to navigate in it: what to wear, how to get downtown, how to behave, and what to expect in that world once they get there. More important than these specifics, youth learn that people they know--program staff, sponsors, volunteers--have information about and access to a larger world which a young person may be able to tap. As Coleman notes: " An important form of social capital is the potential for information that inheres in social relations. Information is important in providing a basis for action. But acquisition of information is

costly. The minimum it requires is attention, which is always in short supply " (Coleman, 1990, p. 310).

Creating Norms of Reciprocity and Trust

It is the combined energy and investment of adults and youth that make primary supports happen. Respect for youth and their contributions are reflected in the contexts programs create. Many primary supports see and treat participants as members, and often reach out to and include them with signs and symbols of membership both more and less obvious: the uniforms that identify the Tumblers and the tee shirts worn by OSP youth, the names groups give themselves, and use of photographs.

> "Pictures is a big thing that we do. We snap a lot of pictures all the time and we've got them up all over so kids are always seeing themselves in groups. There's one we're blowing up now that caught us all at playing out in the snow."

Youth are expected to contribute to primary support organizations as intentionally as adults. In many organizations, the activities underscore the importance of reciprocity and trust--the requirements and rewards of shared effort. In the Tumblers, the performance of all depends on the actions of each--on arriving on time, uniform in good shape, and catching each other as they fly through the air. Similarly, the Youth Communication newspaper can not hit the press unless the reporters, copy editors, layout designers, photographers, advertising sales reps--all youth positions--join in reaching that goal. Youth in many less product-oriented programs are expected to plan and organize activities, to staff and help make offices run, and to act in leadership positions within their own groups and with younger participants.

Ongoing interaction with adults in primary supports is central to the process through which norms are conveyed and reinforced, both implicitly and explicitly. Primary supports set standards about how participants work together and resolve disputes; they also establish expectations for both current contributions and for the future--what is expected of youth when they reach adulthood. These norms are sometimes conveyed through a verbally mediated process in rules written down and referred to. Most are conveyed and reinforced through a process of incidental learning. Adult staff model norms through their own behavior and through the environments they create. Moreover, the general codes of conduct, respecting and caring for each other, apply to youth and adults alike.

> Walking through the halls, Mr. Hawkins met up with a young man as tall and thin as he who cast him a stern look. Grabbing his own cap off his head, Mr. Hawkins reported, "We have a rule that you can't wear caps inside, and I'm an offender. Kids love to catch me out at it."

Programs often embody expectations about reciprocal investments. Programs and staff, believing in the capacities of young people, invest in creating opportunities for youth and youth contributions. If young people trust these views of themselves and invest the time and the often tough, disciplined effort, adults reciprocate, working with similar intensity to counteract obstacles and push the limits of opportunities. Programs are advocates for their participants--working hard to get youth into magnet programs in the public schools or scholarships in private schools, and securing access to counseling, health care, housing, or legal counsel for youth whose participation and progress depend on it.

The fact that primary supports are voluntary undertakings is central to their ability to generate norms of reciprocity. Because neither initial nor continued participation is mandated, participants have to choose repeatedly to affiliate with and renew a commitment to the group

and its standards, which works to reinforce shared norms. The voluntary nature of primary support participation also reinforces the development of cooperation and trust among members. While all associations have a mixture of communal and bureaucratic aspects, and those involving youth include some exercise of adult authority, primary supports have a far greater sense of common purpose and of symmetry in the relationships between youth and adults than are generally formed in involuntary settings. This facilitates trust and investment in "continuing relationships of exchange" (Putnam, 1993).

Monitoring Accountability and Applying Sanctions

Programs use the ongoing contact among youth and adults as the primary means of monitoring adherence to expectations about conduct within programs. Programs also use fairly simple and direct mechanisms like keeping attendance. Monitoring youth conduct beyond programs may entail practices like asking participants to bring in report cards and staying in touch with school teachers. In some cases, sanctions take the form of greater structure and added assistance--for example, expecting a young person to show up daily to do homework or to work with a tutor. Often sanctions tend to be forms of exclusion from participation either for cooling-off or as a loss of privileges: leaving the room, being benched from a game, staying behind on outings, and ultimately being excluded from participation altogether.

This is the ultimate sanction--removal from the network of participation and all it offers. In being written out, young people lose identification with a group that can shape and validate a sense of who they are. More concretely, this sanction threatens loss of friends and

adult investment and of access to immediate and long-range opportunities. Exclusion from a program may also invoke parental disapproval.

Programs vary in the extent to which they involve youth in setting both rules and sanctions and the swiftness and severity with which sanctions are applied. At one end--in programs wanting youth to make the program their own, to have a sense of both investment in and control of the environment--youth set the rules. In these cases, program staff often find that youth create more, and more strenuous, rules than adults, rules that often need softening after a trial period. At another extreme are programs with rules and sanctions set by adults without opportunity for youth input or amendment. Programs that set rules more autocratically seem to apply them both more rigidly and swiftly. Most programs engage youth in discussion of rules and sanctions and work to fit them both to the purpose of motivating youth participation and achievement. In general, programs seem to search for graduated levels of suspension, and for finding ways to "leave the door open" for youth to reconnect.

What Youth Derive

Participation in primary supports can contribute to the cognitive and social development of young people. Primary supports include opportunities to apply and extend academic learning and to participate as part of a group endeavor in setting goals, identifying problems and strategies for their solution, and contributing to a product or performance in ways that build on individual knowledge and skills. Participation in primary supports also contributes to developing personal qualities including the capacity for leadership, compromise, persistence, and sociability. These competencies and qualities are central to learning and

performance in an "information economy" and as instrumental for participation in a democratic society (Resnick, 1987; Reich, 1991; United States Department of Labor, 1992).

In these environments, individuals can use their primary interests and orientations (musical, bodily-kinesthetic, linguistic, and others) for learning in ways that reinforce the integration of skills and their application (Gardner, 1983, 1993). Primary supports can use individual interests as a point of entry for engaging youth in multiple learning activities: reading, writing, researching, using computers. Charles Hammond describes the Bicycle Action Project as a school, a storefront classroom embedded in a retail bike shop.

> When kids walk in here it's entirely different than when they walk into school. They're not expecting to fail. They open the door differently here, they talk differently, their caps turned back on their heads, they're ready. But we teach kids math, reading, and computing skills--in computing gear ratios, in reading plans and manuals, in running our inventory system--and they're turned on. We're teaching through hands-on education and a discovery-type environment that's part of the real world not separate from it. Kids are invested in earning a real bike and in making bike repairs for real customers, it's not practice . . .
>
> We've created an alternative to the traditional school setting, in which a disturbingly high percentage of our kids are failing. And we're constantly in an R&D mode working to create a learning environment that engages kids and gives them a full-cycle (no pun intended) experience: stimulating kids to learn here, we work at building their spirit of inquiry and then rewarding that inquiry through mastery, which further reinforces their enthusiasm and determination to learn. We don't always get it right, but we keep working to follow what experience tells us is working.

In primary supports, learning activities are not about acquiring knowledge passively or in isolation. They usually take the form of group efforts in which youth are simultaneously planning, negotiating, leading, and compromising with others as they engage in a process of active learning--goal-setting, problem-solving, and self-assessment. Youth may not go on to use the specific knowledge gained in a particular program, but their exposure to an active learning process and the personal traits gained through these experiences--persistence,

discipline, reliability, sociability--are relevant to achievement and contribution in school and work and in the functioning of a civil society (Wynn, in press).

Youth engaged in primary supports can develop an instrumental sense of self and an expanded sense of the future--seeing themselves through what they do and can achieve. Participation in a group recognized for its achievements can counteract messages of disregard or worse from the larger society, and a persistent focus in some schools on what youth cannot do. Participation can provide "a socially integrating sense of purpose"and an enlarged vision of choices and routes to achieving them (McLaughlin, 1993).

Primary support programs also represent a reservoir of social capital--in the knowledge and skills of adults and their commitment to youth, in the norms about contribution and reciprocity conveyed to participants, in the mechanisms for knowing whether or not contributions have been made, and in the sanctions that are often created with and by youth. Through these characteristics and the connections they create to a broader world and people in it, primary support programs introduce young people to the experience of generating and sustaining social capital. For all youth, even those from families with rich social capital resources of their own, this experience models participation in civic life beyond the family, affording a proving ground for democratic participation.

Some Implications for Education

The benefits that youth derive from participation in primary supports are powerful and important for both cognitive and social development. It is worth exploring whether these benefits can be extended to the setting with primary responsibility for the education of young people--the schools--and whether schools and primary support programs together can

synergistically increase these benefits, making both sectors more productive generators of human and social capital. One way to extend the benefits of primary support programs to the school setting is to apply primary support practices found to be particularly effective for both cognitive and social development to the instructional practices of schools. Another is to explore the complementarity between schools and primary supports more broadly, in order to identify options for creating or increasing the connections among them.

Instructional Practice and the Nature of Schools

Primary supports provide approaches for engaging youth in learning through applying and extending what they know and are able to do as part of a group endeavor. Characteristics of primary support programs that are relevant to engaging youth in learning, to the structure of schools, and instructional practices include:

- Providing opportunities to participate in efforts in which youth initiative is central, and to learn about and affect activities and issues of importance
- Creating a discovery environment that is part of the real world in which youth are involved in identifying problems and options for solving them and in leading, negotiating, and compromising in reaching goals
- Offering opportunities to participate in group endeavors that engage youth in contributing to concrete products and performances, in assessments of their own achievements, and in deliberations about ways of improving the results
- Participation in undertakings guided by the ongoing investment of adults, creating relationships that start with youth where they are, set high expectations and offer sustained supports, and expect to stay with youth over time
- Providing programs and practices attentive to developing youth competencies and achievement in a context which also meets youth needs
- Reaching out to families and other institutions important in the lives and development of youth in ways that create both informal and deliberate interactions

Many schools may now be using some of these practices, and many school reforms are premised on doing so. Nevertheless many students, particularly in low-income communities, experience schools as regimented, impersonal, and alienating (Heath & McLaughlin, 1994; Pittman & Cahill, 1993). As Croninger and Lee point out in this volume, the communal organization of schools can foster practices similar to primary supports characteristics--positive social relationships, shared goals, and high standards--practices that appear to account for positive student outcomes particularly for youth from disadvantaged circumstances.

The Complementarity of Primary Supports and Schools

The complementarity between primary supports and schools is profound and is already exploited to some degree by staff in both sectors. The potential of this complementarity for generating both human and social capital could be more fully realized by starting simply with greater awareness on the part of both sectors of the aims and efforts of the other. Beyond these informal efforts, there are ways for the two sectors to cooperate more fully through the establishment of any of a number of more formal connections.

Relieving School Obligations. Schools have been expected to add to their academic mandate increasing obligations for the physical, social, and moral development of children. These expectations have resulted in schools' including physical education, health and reproductive education, values clarification, character education, and community service, among other activities, in their curricula. Policies that recognize the potential contributions of primary supports may help to alleviate the schools' increasingly complex obligations. Because of their roots in communities, primary supports may be particularly well suited to

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

relieving schools of the obligation to provide instruction in subjects whose content is shaped by cultural norms and values, such as character education or values clarification.

Connecting Primary Supports and Schools. Primary supports build connections to schools through practices that include asking participants to bring in report cards, helping parents and youth set educational goals, holding high school fairs for youth and parents, introducing participants to high schools through use of their facilities, touring college campuses, and securing youth access to high schools and colleges through assistance with admissions and scholarships. Conversely, school staff refer students to primary supports when they know of them and of student interests in or possible benefit from what they offer.

Primary supports and schools can more fully benefit from what the other offers, and more effectively transmit these benefits to young people, by creating pathways for youth and parents across these sectors and relationships among the individuals who work in them. Greater knowledge of the existence and potential benefits of primary supports could enable teachers and other school personnel to facilitate youth organization connections for students. Information about curriculum and school-based skill development could enable primary supports to weave the application of relevant substance and skills into their programs.

Primary supports often work to assist youth academically, for example through homework help or tutoring. If there were opportunities for contact between program staff and teachers, particularly for youth struggling academically, teachers might identify for program staff the needs of individual students for focused assistance on core concepts or use of alternative instructional strategies. Similarly, teachers can be isolated in their classrooms with limited opportunities to gauge the life challenges facing individual students and even less

capacity to provide support or added assistance beyond the classroom; the relations between teachers and parents may be confined to limited and often uncomfortable interactions around grades or behavior problems, or there may be no connections at all.

Greater contact across the two sectors could allow primary supports staff to assist in linking parents and schools and in attending to youth and parent problems including some that impinge on school attendance or achievement. Primary supports can serve a bridging function between parents and schools that can result from the relationships developed between staff and parents through parents' involvement in primary supports as part of their ongoing activities for their children or themselves. In addition, primary support staff may have the ability and training to seek out parents and engage them in addressing problems (Canada, 1995).

Working alliances among teachers and youth organization staff are now most likely to occur when they have established formal relationships with each other, as they have begun to, for example, in New York City's Beacon's schools. Beacons are school-based community centers keeping school buildings open 16 hours a day year round. Operated by neighborhood organizations, their intent is to provide promotional and problem-solving supports and services for children and families and, over the long term, to serve as vehicles for community organization and development (Cahill, 1993). The location of neighborhood organizations on school sites has begun to create opportunities for staff and teachers to meet and to seek assistance from each other. These alliances are one of the potential benefits of locating primary supports in school facilities. However, having schools as the principal place for the

formation of these relationships, limits interactions to organizations working in or with schools (Chaskin & Richman, 1992).

Supplementing Schools. As school budgets are cut for subjects such as the arts, schools and non-profit organizations are creating partnerships to supplement student opportunities. These partnerships, using flexible funds (e.g., Chapter I or foundation funding), may be the only source of student exposure to art or music and, in some cases, to curriculum enrichment in science or foreign languages. More systematic arrangements could be created, with primary supports providing an applied aspect of academic education. Primary supports staff could work with schools to design and conduct applied, project-based learning relevant to the substance and skills being taught in core academic subjects as well as in areas of curricular enrichment. These activities could take place on school sites or in primary support or other community settings. Associations of this kind could be pursued for entire classes or in more individualized ways, for example, through internships in areas such as arts, science, journalism, or others (Cahill, 1995).

Alliances between schools and primary supports could provide an added element of choice to schooling, offering students settings and circumstances in which to learn that are tied to but separate from schools. Such alliances could also provide opportunities for students to integrate learning and skills and develop competencies associated with goal-setting, problem-solving, leadership development, and experience with group planning, action, and reflection--skills considered fundamental to workforce performance in "the information economy."

Sharing Schooling. In an increasing number of cases, schools and primary supports are going beyond supplementing what they each offer to jointly designing and staffing schools. These associations have begun to occur under the aegis of Charter schools legislation and efforts such as the New American Schools Corporation--"the break the mold schools." These schools extend the interactive and applied learning orientation in primary supports to the entire school curriculum and to the structure, context, and practice of the school as an organization. Outward Bound schools and New Vision schools in New York are examples.

The learning strategies and styles of Outward Bound, an experiential, adventure-based program, are being applied by a number of schools developing new models for education. These schools are involving students and teachers in creating joint learning expeditions--extended, in-depth projects that explore topics or themes in ways that include inquiry in and contributions to real-world settings and communities. These schools are developing assessment practices based on group performance and student reflections on their contribution to these efforts (Outward Bound, undated).

The New York City Board of Education and the Fund for New York City Public Education have jointly created opportunities for the development of small (500 to 700 students) comprehensive high schools planned by coalitions including diverse combinations of community, cultural, and civic organizations, parents groups, existing schools and colleges, union chapters and churches, and others. Sixteen New Visions schools have been established. They include the Academy for Community Development, where students study public policy and urban planning and work on long-term projects for rebuilding their neighborhoods; the CSC 25 Collaborative, which uses its Queens community as its campus, with students

studying and working in local institutions to assess community needs and implement in-service projects; and the El Puente Academy for Peace and Justice, which integrates academic learning and community contributions focusing on issues of environmental equity and social justice. These new approaches to schooling increase the scope of the curriculum and the forms of learning available to young people, enhancing both cognitive and social development. They generate social capital not only in the processes of cross-sector collaboration they employ, but frequently in their curriculum content as well, focusing on community interaction and major issues in civic life.

Recognizing Youth Achievement. Recognition of the knowledge, skills, and competencies youth acquire in both school and out-of-school settings, by their schools, employers, and others, can add to young people's sense of accomplishment and credentials. At present, the only acknowledged record of a young person's achievements is a high school transcript (primarily course grades); some add a diploma and admissions test scores.

Use of a resume or record of in- and out-of-school learning and experience could give students and those concerned with their learning and development a new appreciation for the learning that occurs across settings, and for the importance of cognitive and social development, and could be a step toward crediting youth for the full range of their knowledge and skills. This recognition could stimulate increased youth involvement in a variety of learning settings, and increase the likelihood that alternative modes of learning would be available to young people, in more settings and for more time. This could obviate the need for schools to assume the full burden of engaging students over longer school days and school years.

Acknowledgment of cross-sector learning and skills by the business sector could create pathways to paid employment. Through this process, businesses could clarify the competencies they expect employees to have, and youth could use their experiences in school and other settings as evidence that they have demonstrated competencies of these kinds. In effect, a career ladder for youth could be created, taking young people from increased learning and leadership in school and other settings to paid employment in the business sector.

Mechanisms of this kind have been proposed by researchers and policy makers (United States Department of Labor, 1992; Heath & McLaughlin, 1994; Barton, 1995). Records of youth achievement in and out of school are being tested in several forms in the United States, including portfolio systems and an electronically accessible experience record (Barton, 1981). In the United Kingdom the government is implementing a National Record of Achievement, a process that links individual goal setting and a written record of achievement beginning in school with a continuing employee review and staff development processes in adulthood (Research International, undated).

VIII. Some Cautions and Conundrums

This chapter argues that primary supports can enhance youth development in ways that both depend on and generate social capital, and that creating connections among primary supports and schools could strengthen what can be achieved for students, for schools and primary supports as organizations, and for the stores of social capital on which individuals participating in these organizations and others can draw. There are policy and research issues, however, that require attention if we are to pursue approaches that are in fact able to

enhance youth development, the organizations involved, and the nature of connections among individuals in which social capital inheres. These issues relate to the need for instrumental definitions of youth competencies and social capital and for the exploration of connections among primary supports, schools, and other settings.

Developing Instrumental Definitions of Youth Competencies and Social Capital

Maximizing the ability of primary supports to enhance development in ways that depend on and generate social capital hinges in part on more clearly articulated definitions of both youth competencies and social capital. In addition, it is important to further explore the circumstances and mechanisms through which primary supports can enhance development and generate social capital.

Greater clarity is needed about the competencies youth need to function adequately in adolescence and adulthood as a framework for policymaking broadly and for enhancing primary supports in particular. As a society we have tended to focus on "credentialed" capacities--cognitive and social skills related to education and employment, and devoted little attention to defining competencies relevant to personal and civic life (Pittman & Cahill, 1993). Broader operational definitions of youth competencies are needed as a basis for refining the content and practices of primary support programs and as a set of goals for youth to which schools, primary supports, and others can contribute.

More also needs to be understood about the capacity of primary supports to enhance these competencies, and the principles, practices, and mechanisms through which primary supports achieve these effects. To date, the understanding of primary supports has largely been drawn from descriptive studies focusing on more robust and better functioning programs

(Heath & McLaughlin 1993; McLaughlin et al., 1994; Pittman & Cahill, 1992; Pittman & Wynn, forthcoming). Too little is now known about the impact programs of different kinds can have in building youth capacities, under what circumstances, and for which youth. There are parallel challenges in refining understanding of how and in what circumstances primary supports depend on and generate social capital. These challenges include the need to better define social capital and its dimensions in ways that can be documented.

Linking Primary Supports, Schools, and Other Settings

A range of possible connections among primary supports and schools are suggested in this chapter. These alliances range from primary supports and schools serving as referral resources for each other to connections in which schools and primary supports can more formally structure and extend what they contribute to youth learning and development. As increasing attention is devoted to policies that create full-service schools, with schools as the hub of supports and services for children and families, there are questions about the advantages and limitations of physically locating resources for youth and families within schools (Dryfoos, 1994). The pivotal role assigned to schools in creating connections with other learning resources and problem-solving services has added another responsibility to those already burdening schools at a time when their basic educational mission is a substantial challenge in itself (Graham, 1993). There is another equally important disadvantage in these arrangements; a policy approach that places schools at the center--with other supports and services operating as satellites--can limit the variety of and access to what is offered to children and families. Expecting schools to exercise leadership in creating connections among services and supports filters the planning and operation of what is provided through

the mandates and world view of the school. The resources brought together--and where and how they are made available--are shaped by the priorities and bureaucratic requirements of schools. If access to critical resources is through the schools, they may not be used by children and families who are outside the orbit of the schools or who are uncomfortable within it (Chaskin & Richman, 1992; Committee for Economic Development, 1994).

There has been recognition of a number of the constraints associated with the full-service schools approach and efforts to offset them. In some initiatives, the design and delivery of services is seen as the responsibility of community-based organizations. An aim in these efforts is that schools function over extended hours and days as community centers, with oversight provided by an advisory body drawn from the community. These approaches are designed to center responsibility in the community more broadly and to bring the community into the schools. Nevertheless, schools remain at the center as sites of or conduits to the resulting supports and services that are offered.

It is worth exploring what kinds of connections among parents, schools, primary supports, services, the business sector and others contribute to the development of youth competencies and to linkages among individuals and institutions that generate social capital? This overarching question subsumes others: In what ways are different kinds of linkages among individuals and institutions likely to engage some youth and bypass others? How tight do the connections between supports, services and schools have to be to affect these institutions? Is it necessary to have primary support staff on site in schools to transfer perspectives and practices among them, or will a more diffuse set of connections--and of what kinds--have similar effects? Will school-based or more extended off-site links have greater benefits for

generating social capital, connecting wider numbers of people across more diverse networks? Exploring options for creating networks among schools and the resources and services in communities should illuminate their relative benefits--and costs--to individuals, organizations, and broader aims including social capital formation.

Community Benefits: Extending Social Capital

Beyond recognizing and reinforcing the learning that occurs for youth in primary supports and schools, creating connections among adults in families, primary supports, schools, businesses, and other settings is likely to facilitate the development of better respected and more closely shared norms and values, connections of benefit to both individual youth and youth overall. As Putnam points out, the more often people interact in a variety of settings, the more likely they are to develop "strong norms" and to cooperate in ways that reinforce them (Putnam, 1993). Connections among individuals and institutions important in the lives of young people are one way to work toward creating mutually reinforcing opportunities for youth. A benefit of creating connections among individuals in these settings is that having created alliances on behalf of youth, these connections can serve as the basis of collective action to address other common causes. In sum, it is connections among individuals in networks of voluntary association that are the stuff on which civic engagement and action is based.

Acknowledgement: Sunil Garg and Joan Costello have contributed significantly to thinking about the relationship of primary supports and social capital and Joan Costello to refining formulations of the contribution of primary supports to youth development. The author is also indebted to Harold Richman. His original interest in primary supports and his leadership in framing policy research concerning them has been and continues to be pivotally important. Thanks also go to Susan Campbell whose wisdom with words and the ideas they convey is instrumental in identifying murkiness and clarifying intent.

References Cited

Ball, A., and Heath, S. 1993. Dances of identity: Finding an ethnic self in the arts. In Heath & McLaughlin, M.W. (Eds.). *Identity & inner-city youth: Beyond ethnicity and gender*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Barton, P.E. 1995. A school-to-work transition system: The role of standards and assessments. In Resnick, L.B. & Wirt, J.G. (Eds.) *Linking school and work: Roles for standard and assessment*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Barton, S. L. 1981. *Career passports: The job connection*. Washington D.C.: National Institute for Work and Learning.

Cahill, M. 1995. Personal communication. November 1995.

Cahill, M. 1993. *A documentation report on the New York City Beacons initiative*. New York: The Youth Development Institute, Fund for the City of New York.

Canada, G. 1995. *Fist stick knife gun: A personal history of violence in America*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development. Task Force on Youth Development and Community Programs. 1992. In *A matter of time: Risk and opportunity in the nonschool hours*. New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Chaskin, R.J., and Richman, H. 1992. Concerns about school-linked services: Institution-based versus community-based models. *The Future of Children*, Spring:107-117.

Coleman, J.S. 1990. *Foundations of social theory*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Coleman, J.S. 1988. Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology* 94(sup):S95-S120.

Coleman, J.S., and Hoffer, T.B. 1987. *Public and Private Schools: The Impact of Communities*. New York: Basic Books.

Committee for Economic Development. 1994. *Putting learning first: Governing and managing the schools for high achievement.* Draft Statement. Washington, DC.

Connell, J. 1992. *The importance of learning about and building on the policies, programs, and effects of voluntary youth-serving organizations.* Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Dryfoos, J.G. 1994. *Full-service schools: A revolution in health and social services for children, youth, and families.* San Fransico: Jossey-Bass.

Furstenberg, F. 1990. *How families manage risk and opportunity in dangerous neighborhoods.* Paper presented at the 84th annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, Washington, DC.

Gardner, H. 1983. *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences.* New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Gardner, H. 1993. *Multiple intelligences: The theory in practice.* New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Graham, P.A. 1993. What American has expected of its schools over the past century. *American Journal of Education, 101* (Feb), 83-98.

Granovetter, M.S. 1973. "The Strength of Weak Ties." *American Journal of Sociology* 78.6: 1360-80.

Heath, S.B., and McLaughlin, M.W. 1994. The best of both worlds: Connecting schools and community youth organizations for all-day, all-year learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly* 30(3):278-300.

Heath, S.B., and McLaughlin, M.W. 1993. *Identity and inner-city youth.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Heath, S.B., and McLaughlin, M.W. 1991. Community organizations as family: Endeavors that engage and support adolescents. *Phi Delta Kappan* April:623-627

Ianni, F. A.J. 1989. *The search for structure: A report on american youth today.* New York: The Free Press.

Kagan, S.L., Goffin, S.G., Golub, S.A., & Pritchards, E. 1995. *Toward systemic reform: Service integration for young children and their families.* Virginia: National Center for Service Integration.

Kotlowitz, A. 1991. *There are no children here: The story of two boys growing up in the other america.* New York: Doubleday, division of Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing Group, Inc.

Littell, J., and Wynn, J. 1989. *The availability and use of community resources for young adolescents in an inner city and a suburban community.* Chicago: Chapin Hall Center for Children at the University of Chicago.

McLaughlin, M.W., Irby, M.A., and Langman, J. 1994. *Urban sanctuaries: Neighborhood organizations in the lives and futures of inner-city youth.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

McLaughlin, M.W. 1993. Embedded identities:Enabling balance in urban context. In Heath & McLaughlin, M.W. (Eds.). *Identity & inner-city youth: Beyond ethnicity and gender.* New York: Teachers College Press.

McLaughlin, M.W., and Heath, S.B. 1993. *Identity and inner-city youth: Beyond ethnicity and gender.* S.B. Heath, and M.W. McLaughlin (eds). New York: Teachers College Press.

National Crime Prevention Council. 1992. *Creating a climate of hope: Ten neighborhoods tackle the drug crisis.* Washington, DC: National Crime Prevention Council.

Ostrom, E. 1990. *Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action.* J.E. Alt (ed), Harvard University. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Outward Bound. Undated. *Outward Bound USA.* New York: Garrison.

Pittman, K.J., and Cahill, M. 1993. Pushing the boundaries of education: The implications of a youth development approach to education policies, structures, and collaborations. In *Ensuring student success through collaboration.* Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Pittman, K.J., and Cahill, M. 1992. *Youth and caring: The role of youth programs in the development of caring.* Washington, DC: Center for Youth Development and Policy Research.

Pittman, K.J., and Wright, M. 1991. *A rationale for enhancing the role of the non-school voluntary sector in youth development.* New York: Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development.

Pittman, K.J., Wynn, J., et. al. In press. *People, places, and possibilities: Community organizations and youth development.*

Putnam, R.D. 1995. Bowling alone: America's Declining Social Capital. *Journal of Democracy* January:65-78.

Putnam, R.D. 1993. *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Ramirez, S., and Dewar, T. 1994. *El Puente Academy for Peace and Justice: A case study of building social capital*. Minneapolis : Rainbow Research.

Reich, R.B. 1991. *The work of nations: Preparing ourselves for 21st century capitalism*. New York: Vintage Books.

Research International. Undated. *Evaluation of the national record of achievement: A summary of the findings (Part I)*.

Resnick, L.B. 1987. *Education and learning to think*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

United States Department of Labor. 1992. *Learning a living: A blueprint for high performance: A SCANS report for America 2000 (executive summary)*. Washington D.C.: The Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills.

Venkatesh, S. 1993. *Black gangs and the reconstruction of 'community' in an urban* ghetto. Unpublished paper. Department of Sociology, University of Chicago.

Weiss, H.B. 1988. *Nurturing our young children: Building new partnerships among families, schools, and communities*. Paper prepared for the Chief State School Officers.

Weissbourd, B. and Kagan, S.L. 1989. Family support programs: Catalysts for change. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry 59* (1), 20-31.

Whalen, S.P., and Wynn, J.R. 1995. Enhancing Primary Services for youth through an infrastructure of social services. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 10(1):88-110.

Wynn, J. In press. *Primary Services, Schools, and Other Sectors: Implications for Learning and Civic Life*. Prepared for the Harvard Project on Schooling and Children.

Wynn, J. 1995. Enhancing social services for children, youth, and families. *Public Welfare*, Fall: 12-23.

Wynn, J., Costello, J., Halpern, R., and Richman, H. 1994. *Children, families, and communities: A new approach to social services*. Chicago: Chapin Hall Center for Children, the University of Chicago.

Endnotes

1. Coileagues and I at Chapin Hall coined the term "primary services" several years ago to suggest that these resources were, first, *primary* (i.e., oriented to promotion of development for all children rather than the remediation of problems in special cases) and, second, *services* (i.e., to be regarded as an integral part of more broadly defined social services for children and families, which have been focused almost exclusively on such problems as child abuse and neglect, mental illness, and deviant behavior) See for example, Wynn, J., Costello, J., Halpern, R., and Richman, H. 1994. *Children, families, and communities: A new approach to social services.* Chicago: Chapin Hall Center for Children, the University of Chicago; and Wynn, J. 1995. Enhancing social services for children, youth, and families. *Public Welfare,* Fall: 12-23. Recently, we changed the term to "primary supports." This indicates no decrease in our commitment to seeing these resources as essential and integral to a comprehensive service system response that both supports development and responds to problems. The change arose from a desire to reflect the fact that we were not only responding to problems (with services) but *supporting* development with resources. It was also meant to recognize accepted nominclautre for sports teams, afterschool programs and the like, where the term *services* is not generally employed or easily accepted.

2. Portions of the text in this section are drawn from a paper on education policy prepared by the author for the Harvard Project on Schooling and Children.

3. The descriptions of programs and quotations from staff and participants are taken from interviews and field notes of research concerning primary support programs in which the author was directly involved. Instances in which material is drawn from other sources are identified by inclusion of the relevant citation.